

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In an Office Action dated August 22, 2007, claims 1-30 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Applicants have amended claims 7, 9, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, and 27 herein to fix minor typos, more clearly recite the claimed invention, and remedy the section 101 issue raised by the Examiner.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 101

In the 1st paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 16-20 under 35 USC §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is now traversed.

Claims 16, 17, and 19 have been amended to recite that the computer program product is embodied on a tangible computer readable storage medium. Claims 18 and 20 depend from these claims. Applicants submit that claims 16-20 now are directed to statutory subject matter.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs of the Office Action Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 10, 14-16, 19-21, 24-26, 29, and 30 under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,477,271 ("Cooper") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,995,079 ("Sheasby"); in the 4th and 5th paragraphs Examiner rejects claims 3 and 11 as allegedly being unpatentable over

Cooper and Sheasby, in further view of U.S. Patent 4,926,360 (“Spink”); in the 6th paragraph Examiner rejects claims 4 and 12 as allegedly being unpatentable over Cooper and Sheasby, in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059195A1 (“Cras”); and in the 7th paragraph Examiner rejects claims 5 and 13 as allegedly being unpatentable over Cooper and Sheasby, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,123 (“Davis”). These rejections are now traversed.

Independent claims 1, 16, 21, and 26 respectively recite a method, computer program product, system, and means for receiving user input for changing a parameter via a graphical user interface, comprising, *inter alia*, “displaying **a control comprising** a drag region, an incrementer region, and a decrementer region, **the drag region comprising a text box** displaying a value for the parameter,” “in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a first direction, **dynamically incrementing** the value of the parameter,” and “in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a second direction, **dynamically decrementing** the value of the parameter.”

These aspects of the claimed invention pertain to a combined control with regions and functionalities typically occurring in multiple controls, providing quicker numeric value editing, control of multiple parameters, and provides for both an input and an output function in a compact space. *See* Specification, Summary at [0006].

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, Cooper merely discloses “a *plurality* of controls” (emphasis added), including region

textboxes 2-10 *and* region input sliders 12-20. *See* Cooper, FIG. 1A, col. 5, ll. 34-37.

Cooper discloses precisely the conventional multiple control interface discussed in the Background section, in which the user must switch between the various controls to achieve a desired result. *See* Specification, Background at [0002] – [0003]. However, Cooper does not disclose or suggest **a control** comprising a drag region, an incrementer region, **and** a decrementer region.

Further, Applicants submit that Cooper does not disclose any drag region at all. The Examiner admits that Cooper does not teach a drag region that dynamically increments and decrements parameter value upon dragging therein. Office Action dated 8/22/07, p. 3. The drag region's **defining characteristic** is its ability to perform this drag functionality. Thus, if the Examiner admits that Cooper shows no such functionality, he also admits that Cooper shows no such region. Further, proper antecedent basis requires that “the drag region” as stated in the dynamically increment and dynamically decrement elements is the drag region of the control comprising a drag region.

Finally, Cooper also lacks a drag region “comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter.” Even if one were to assume, *arguendo*, that Cooper disclosed any sort of drag region, it is clear from FIG. 1 that the text box portion (region textboxes 2-10) is *separate* from the portion the Examiner refers to as housing a drag region (region input sliders 12-20), rather than “comprising” it. Thus, Cooper does not disclose or suggest at least “displaying **a control comprising** a drag region, an incrementer region, and a decrementer region, **the drag region comprising a text box** displaying a value for the parameter,” as well as the elements the Examiner explicitly admits are missing from Cooper:

“in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a first direction, dynamically incrementing the value of the parameter,” and

“in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a second direction, dynamically decrementing the value of the parameter.”

Sheasby does not remedy these deficiencies. Sheasby merely shows a mouse pointer clicking on an “edge” between sides of a bar graph that when dragged to a desired position the numeric value changes. *See* Sheasby, FIGS. 1 and 2, col. 4, ll. 48-52. However, Sheasby does not indicate that the change is *dynamic*. Nor does the edge 18 referenced by the Examiner fit the claimed definition of a “drag region **comprising a text box** displaying a value for the parameter.” It is unclear to Applicants how an “edge” could comprise a text box. Thus Sheasby, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not show at least “in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a first direction, dynamically incrementing the value of the parameter,” nor “in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a second direction, dynamically decrementing the value of the parameter.” In addition, Sheasby, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not remedy the other deficiencies noted above, nor does the Examiner argue that it does.

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. Thus,

Applicants submit that claims 1, 16, 21, and 26 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Independent claim 2 recites a method for receiving user input for changing a parameter via a graphical user interface, comprising, *inter alia*:

“displaying a control comprising a drag region, the drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter;”

“in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a first direction, **dynamically incrementing** the value of the parameter;”

“in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a second direction, **dynamically decrementing** the value of the parameter;” and

“in response to a user command for displaying recent values, displaying a **contextual menu of recent values.**”

These aspects of the claimed invention pertain to displaying a contextual menu of recent values for a parameter displayed in a drag region, which allows the user to, e.g., select a recent value to populate the text box with that value.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, as discussed above the combination of Cooper and Sheasby does not show “displaying a control comprising a drag region, the drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter,” nor “in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a first direction,

dynamically incrementing the value of the parameter,” nor “in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a second direction, dynamically decrementing the value of the parameter.”

Further, Cooper does not disclose or suggest use of a **contextual menu** of recent values in conjunction with its controls. The Examiner points to textbox regions 2-10 of FIG. 1A as showing recent values. Office Action at p. 5. As a preliminary matter, textboxes 2-10 each only show a *single, current* value. Claim 2 recites displaying a contextual menu of recent **values** (plural) in conjunction with the control (singular) of the claimed invention. Further, the Examiner does not provide a reference to a location showing, nor can Applicants find in Cooper, any disclosure or suggestion of a contextual menu. Thus, Cooper also does not show “in response to a user command for displaying recent values, **displaying a contextual menu** of recent values.”

Sheasby does not remedy this deficiency, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. In addition, Applicants can find no disclosure in Sheasby of a contextual menu of recent values. Thus, Sheasby, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element.

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 2, shown above to be patentable over the cited references and reciting additional features not shown in the cited references. For these

reasons, Applicants submit that claims 3-5 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner.

In addition, with respect to claim 3, Spink does not remedy this deficiency, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. In addition, Applicants can find no disclosure in Spink of a contextual menu of recent values. Thus, Spink, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element, and claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for at least this additional reason.

In addition, with respect to claim 4, Cras does not remedy this deficiency, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. In addition, Applicants can find no disclosure in Cras of a contextual menu **of recent values**. Thus, Cras, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element, and claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for at least this additional reason.

In addition, with respect to claim 5, Davis does not remedy this deficiency, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. In addition, Applicants can find no disclosure in Davis of a contextual menu of recent values. Thus, Davis, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element, and claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for at least this additional reason.

Independent claim 10 recites a method for receiving user input for changing a parameter via a graphical user interface, comprising:

displaying a control comprising a drag region, the drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter;

- in response to receiving user input positioning a graphical pointer within the text box, clicking, and keying in a value, changing the value of the parameter;
- in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a first direction, dynamically incrementing the value of the parameter;
- in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a second direction, dynamically decrementing the value of the parameter;
- in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region to a first side of the text box and a user command for displaying boundaries, displaying a contextual menu to select an upper boundary for the value; and
- in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region to a second side of the text box and user command for displaying boundaries, displaying a contextual menu to select a lower boundary for the value.

These aspects of the claimed invention pertain to displaying a contextual menu for selecting boundaries for the value displayed in the textbox.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. As discussed in conjunction with claim 2, Cooper and Sheasby, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, do not show a contextual menu. Thus, it follows that they do not show a contextual menu for selecting upper and lower boundaries for the parameter value.

The Examiner points to region input sliders 12-20 for these aspects, indicating that “slider to the right are separate [sic] by boundaries” and “slider to the left are separate by boundaries.” Office Action at p. 6. Although it is unclear to Applicants what the Examiner means this language to show, Applicants assume the Examiner means that a slider 12-20 all the way to one side is *at its boundary*. Assuming that this is what the depicted sliders show, this is not, and does not **suggest** selecting an upper or lower boundary for the parameter value. Rather, it shows only that some minimum and/or maximum **exists** (as it must on any

non-infinite scale), but says nothing about how it is **selected**, or set. Moreover, as discussed above, no contextual menu is shown in Cooper, and thus **no contextual menu for making such a selection**.

Sheasby does not remedy this deficiency, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. In addition, Applicants can find no disclosure in Sheasby of a contextual menu for selecting boundaries. Thus, Sheasby, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element.

In addition, Cooper and Sheasby do not show other elements of claim 10 as discussed above in conjunction with claims 1 and 2.

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 11-13 depend from claim 10, shown above to be patentable over the cited references and reciting additional features not shown in the cited references. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 11-13 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner.

In addition, with respect to claim 11, Spink does not remedy this deficiency, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. In addition, Applicants can find no disclosure in Spink of a contextual menu for selecting boundaries. Thus, Spink, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element, and claim 11 is patentably

distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for at least this additional reason.

In addition, with respect to claim 12, Cras does not remedy this deficiency, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. In addition, Applicants can find no disclosure in Cras of a contextual menu **for selecting boundaries**. Thus, Cras, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element, and claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for at least this additional reason.

In addition, with respect to claim 13, Davis does not remedy this deficiency, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. In addition, Applicants can find no disclosure in Davis of a contextual menu for selecting boundaries. Thus, Davis, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element, and claim 13 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for at least this additional reason.

Independent claims 14, 19, 24, and 29 respectively recite a method, computer program product, system, and means for receiving user input for changing a parameter via a graphical user interface. Claim 14 is representative:

A method of receiving user input for changing parameters via a graphical user interface, the method comprising:
displaying first and second controls, each control comprising a drag region, each drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for a parameter;
in response to receiving user selection of at least two controls, activating the at least two controls;
in response to receiving user input dragging one of the at least two controls, dynamically changing the parameters values corresponding to the at least two controls.

These aspects of the claimed invention pertain to selecting and activating two controls such that changing one control also changes the other control.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, as discussed above the combination of Cooper and Sheasby does not show “displaying a control comprising a drag region, the drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter.” The above arguments to this effect apply equally here, as claims 14, 19, 24, and 29 indicate that **each** control comprises a drag region.

The Examiner points to Cooper’s FIG. 1A showing two parameters, “hue” and “saturation” for the element “in response to receiving user **selection** of at least two controls, **activating** the at least two controls.” Office Action at p. 7. However, Cooper merely shows a *display* of two controls. Applicants can find no recitation in Cooper of the ability to **select and activate at least two controls**. In fact, Cooper discloses precisely the conventional multiple control interface discussed in the Background section, including several different types of controls and sliders for influencing the value of various parameters of the interface, in which a single control influences a single parameter, and in which the user must switch between the various controls to achieve a desired result. *See* Specification, Background at [0002] – [0003]. In addition, the Examiner admits that Cooper does not show “in response to receiving user input dragging one of the at least two controls, dynamically changing the parameters values corresponding to the at least two controls.” Office Action at p. 7-8.

Sheasby does not remedy these deficiencies. The Examiner cites Sheasby for its dragging of edge 18 into a desired position. Office Action at p. 8. However, Sheasby does not disclose or suggest the ability to **drag one control** and **affect a change in at least two**

controls. In addition, Sheasby suffers the additional deficiencies recited above associated with this element.

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 14, 19, 24, and 29 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 15, 20, 25, and 30 variously depend from claims 14, 19, 24, and 29, which were shown above to be patentable over the cited references, and recite additional features not shown in the cited references. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 15, 20, 25, and 30 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner.

In the 8th paragraph, the Examiner rejects claim 6 as allegedly being unpatentable over Cooper in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0259077A1 (“Adams”). This rejection is now traversed.

Independent claim 6 recites:

A method of receiving user input for changing a parameter via a graphical user interface, the method comprising:

- displaying a control comprising a drag region, the drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter;
- in response to receiving user input positioning a graphical pointer within the text box, clicking, and keying in a value, changing the value of the parameter;
- in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a first direction, dynamically incrementing the value of the parameter at a first rate;
- in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a second

direction, dynamically decrementing the value of the parameter at the first rate;
in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer a third direction, dynamically incrementing the numeric value at a second rate;
in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer in a fourth direction, dynamically decrementing the numeric value at the second rate.

These aspects of the claimed invention pertain to dragging in the drag region incrementing and decrementing at two different rates depending of direction of the drag.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, as discussed above in combination with Sheasby, Cooper does not show “displaying a control comprising a drag region, the drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter.”

The Examiner alleges that Cooper shows keying into the textbox a value to change the value of the parameter. Office Action at p. 19. However, this allegation is inconsistent with the Examiner’s previous admissions that Cooper **does not show** this identical element in his discussion of claims 1, 2, 10, 16, 21, and 26. Office Action at p. 3, 5, 6, 9, 11-12, and 14. Thus, Applicants submit that it is improper to now argue that Cooper discloses this element.

The Examiner alleges that Cooper shows the dynamically incrementing and decrementing at a first rate elements (second and third element of claim 6). Office Action at p. 19-20. This allegation is inconsistent with the Examiner’s previous admissions that Cooper **does not show** using the drag region to increment or decrement the parameter value. Office Action at p. 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 13, and 14. Thus, Applicants submit that Cooper

cannot show this element merely by the addition of the limitation that the parameter is incremented or decremented **at a first rate**.

The Examiner also admits that Cooper does not show dragging in a third and fourth direction to increment and decrement at a second rate.

Adams does not remedy these deficiencies. In the paragraph cited by the Examiner, Adams merely shows the use of a “modifier key” (e.g., Alt or Ctrl) to, e.g., increase the rate at which an image is scrolled. *See Adams at [0032]*. However, Adams does not discuss *placement of a pointer in a drag region* for the purpose of *incrementing or decrementing a value* at all. In addition, Adams makes no mention of using *any* direction for making such changes, much less **a third and fourth direction** different from a first and second direction. For this reason, Adams also does not show dragging in a first and second direction affecting change **at a first rate**. In addition, with respect to the other deficiencies of Cooper discussed above, Adams does not remedy this deficiencies, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. Thus, Adams, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element, and claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner.

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

In the 9th paragraph Examiner rejects claims 7, 17, 22, and 27 as allegedly being unpatentable over Cooper in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0066414A1 (“Czerwinski”). This rejection is now traversed.

Independent claims 7, 17, 22, and 27 respectively recite a method, computer program product, system, and means for changing a parameter via a graphical user interface. Claim 7 is representative:

A method of receiving user input for changing a parameter via a graphical user interface, the method comprising:

- displaying a first control comprising a drag region, the drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter;
- in response to receiving user input positioning a graphical pointer within the text box, clicking, and keying in a value, changing the value of the parameter;
- in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer along a first axis, dynamically changing the value of the parameter; and
- in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer along a second axis, recognizing the input as an attempt by the user to drag and drop the value into a second control.

These aspects of the claimed invention pertain to dragging a control along one axis to change a parameter value, and along a second axis to perform a drag and drop into a second control.

These aspects of the claimed invention pertain to displaying a contextual menu for selecting boundaries for the value displayed in the textbox.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, as discussed above in combination with Sheasby, Cooper does not show “displaying a control comprising a drag region, the drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter.”

As discussed above in conjunction with claim 6, the Examiner’s previous admissions regarding keying into the textbox a value to change the value of the parameter and dragging

to dynamically increment and decrement value contradict the Examiner's allegations here that Cooper shows these elements. Thus, Applicants submit that it is improper to now argue that Cooper discloses these elements.

The Examiner alleges that Cooper shows dragging along a second axis because "sliders 12-20 that have slider [sic] change the value of the parameter." Office Action at p. 21. Applicants submit that Cooper shows a slider 12-20 that moves along a first axis *only*, i.e., horizontally. Applicants can find no disclosure in Cooper of movement **along a second axis**.

Czerwinski does not remedy these deficiencies. Czerwinski merely shows basic drag and drop functionality as known in the art, in the context of control tiles in a taskbar for management of multiple windows in a display. *See* Czerwinski, [0038], FIG. 3, Abstract. Czerwinski does not disclose or suggest Czerwinski also does not recite any first control with a drag region in which to receive "**the input**" to be recognized as drag and drop. Czerwinski shows only *actual* drag and drop of control tiles. *Id.*

In addition, with respect to the other deficiencies of Cooper discussed above, Czerwinski does not remedy this deficiencies, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. Thus, Czerwinski, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element, and claims 7, 17, 22, and 27 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner.

In the 10th paragraph Examiner rejects claims 8, 18, 23, and 28 as allegedly being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Czerwinski, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,920,477 ("Hoffberg").

Claims 8, 18, 23, and 28 variously depend from claims 7, 17, 22, and 27, which were shown above to be patentable over the combination of Cooper and Czerwinski, and recite additional features not shown in the cited references. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 8, 18, 23, and 28 also are patentably distinguishable over Cooper and Czerwinski, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner.

Hoffberg does not remedy these deficiencies, nor does the Examiner argue that it does. Specifically, Hoffberg does not show at least “in response to receiving user input placing the graphical pointer within the drag region, clicking, and dragging the graphical pointer along a second axis, recognizing the input as an attempt by the user to drag and drop the value into second control.”

Thus, Hoffberg, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least this element, and claims 8, 18, 23, and 28 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner for at least this additional reason. In the 11th paragraph Examiner rejects claim 9 as allegedly being unpatentable over Cooper in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,340,966 (“Wang”). This rejection is now traversed.

Independent claim 9 recites:

A method of receiving user input for changing a parameter via a graphical user interface, the method comprising:

displaying a control comprising a drag region, the drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter;

in response to receiving user input hovering a graphical pointer over the text box and keying in a value, changing the value of the parameter;

in response to receiving user input hovering the graphical pointer over the drag region and dragging the graphical pointer in a first direction, dynamically incrementing the value of the parameter;

in response to receiving user input hovering the graphical pointer over the drag region and scrolling a mouse wheel in a first wheel direction, dynamically incrementing the value of the parameter; and

in response to receiving user input hovering the graphical pointer over the drag region and scrolling a mouse wheel in a second wheel direction, dynamically decrementing the value of the parameter.

These aspects of the claimed invention allow a user to hover over a region and then use the region functionality (text box input, increment/decrement) without first clicking or otherwise activating the region of the control using the pointing device.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, as discussed above in combination with Sheasby, Cooper does not show “displaying a control comprising a drag region, the drag region comprising a text box displaying a value for the parameter.”

As discussed above in conjunction with claim 6, the Examiner’s previous admissions regarding keying into the textbox a value to change the value of the parameter and dragging to dynamically increment and decrement value contradict the Examiner’s allegations here that Cooper shows these elements. Thus, Applicants submit that it is improper to now argue that Cooper discloses these elements when the addition of a hovering limitation has been added.

In addition, the section of Cooper cited for these elements of claim 9 recites only basic use of controls for changing parameters generally. *See, e.g.*, Cooper, col. 5, ll. 34-44. In addition, Cooper makes no mention of **hovering** whatsoever, and thus lacks an important aspect of these claim elements.

Wang does not remedy these deficiencies, nor does the Examiner allege that it does. Applicants can find no mention in Wang of a mouse or axis at all in the section provided by the Examiner (Wang, col. 3, ll. 1-5). Office Action at p. 28. In the only portion of the document discussing a mouse and an axis, Wang merely discloses the *use of mousekey with two or three axis pressure points*. See Wang, col. 38, ll. 60-63. No mention whatsoever is made of **scrolling a mouse wheel in any direction**. Wang also lacks any disclosure of **hovering** or **a drag region** of any kind. Thus, Wang, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, does not disclose at least these elements, and claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-30, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: November 23, 2007

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/
Attorneys for Assignee
Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200